

## **Summary of the E-Serials Holdings Survey**

The announcement was sent out around March 7, 2003 to the following electronic mailing lists:

ACQNET

ARL-EJOURNAL

CONSRLST

CONSERHOLD

ERIL-L (Electronic Resources in Libraries)

SERIALST

A total of 155 responses were received for this survey, including two submitted after the closing off date of March 28. All responses have been entered into a MicroSoft Excel spreadsheet for analysis.

### **About Your Library**

#### **1. Type of libraries: (155)**

Academic: 128

Government: 5

Other: 7

Public: 5

Special: 10

#### **2. How many e-serials does your library make available to your users? (155)**

Fewer than 1,000: 26

1,001-5,000: 38

5,001-10,000: 28

More than 10,000: 63

#### **3. What types of e-serials does your library make available to your users? (154)**

a. Full-text journal articles in aggregations: 8

b. E-journal packages: 0

c. Individual titles: 4

a&b: 5

a&c: 14

b&c: 11

a&b&c: 112

### **Electronic Serials Management in Your Library**

#### **4. Does your library currently use a serials management company? (154)**

Yes: 72

No: 82

**Which company do you use? (72)**

CanEbsco: 1  
Ebsco: 1  
Ex Libris: 1  
Gold Rush: 1  
Journal Finder: 1  
Rowecom/Faxon/Divine: 1  
Serials Solutions: 59  
TDNet: 2

**If no, does your library plan to use one in the next five years? (82)**

Yes: 34  
No: 48

**5. Does your library maintain a separate database or list of electronic serial titles? (153)**

Yes: 106  
No: 47

**If yes, where does your electronic serials information reside? (105)**

Access: 18  
Cold Fusion: 2  
FileMaker: 3  
Home-grown database: 1  
InMagic: 2  
Oracle: 2  
SFX: 2  
SQL: 20  
Serials Solutions provided list: 19  
Spreadsheet: 15  
TDNet: 2  
Web pages: 9  
Word: 1

**6. Does your library use a link resolver? (152)**

Yes: 50  
No: 102

**If yes, which link resolver does your library use? (49)**

Article Linker (Serials Solutions): 1  
CyberSpider: 1  
Gold Rush: 1  
Home-grown: 2  
JournalFinder: 1  
LinkBot: 2

LinkOut: 11  
OpenLinks: 3  
SFX: 19

**If no, does your library plan to use one in the next five years? (97)**

Yes: 67  
No: 30

**7. Does your ILS have the capability to perform automated check-in of electronic serials? (137)**

Yes: 29  
No: 108

Most of the 29 respondents who answered “yes” reported that they have Innovative Interface, but none have implemented it yet.

**Do you hope to have this capability in the next five years? (109)**

Yes: 62  
No: 47

**Holdings and Electronic Serials**

**8. Does your library currently add/maintain any level of holdings data for electronic serials in the BIBLIOGRAPHIC record? (150)**

Yes: 55  
No: 95

Most of the libraries who said “yes” add holdings info in 856. One library said they put the holdings info in 530, and another one said they adapt 362 for local data.

**What holdings information does your library provide for electronic serials? (56)**

- a. Summary (Level 3)
  - b. Detailed (Level 4)
  - c. Open-ended
  - d. Closed
- a: 8    b: 1    c: 18    d: 0  
a&c: 4  
a&c&d: 13  
a&b&c&d: 3  
b&c: 1  
b&c&d: 3  
c&d: 5

**Who adds/maintains this data? (64)**

Cataloging: 22  
Cataloging & electronic resource staff: 2  
Cataloging & serials staff: 6  
Cataloging & serials/e-resource: 4

Electronic resource: 1  
Serials/Acquisitions: 8  
Serials & electronic resource staff: 7  
TS general: 3  
Misc.: 4

**9. Does your library currently add/maintain any level of holdings data for electronic serials in the HOLDINGS record in your ILS? (148)**

Yes: 60  
No: 88

**What holdings information does your library provide? (57)**

Most of the 57 respondents who answered the holdings level question said that they use summary and open-ended holdings statement. Some libraries seem to maintain holdings information in both the 856 field and the holdings record. One library also creates item records for statistical purposes.

- a. Summary
- b. Detailed
- c. Open-ended
- d. Closed

a: 11   b: 5   c: 9   d: 0

a&c: 6

a&c&d: 13

a&b&c&d: 2

a&d: 1

b&c: 2

b&c&d: 4

c&d: 4

**Who adds/maintains this data? (63)**

Cataloging: 25

Cataloging & electronic resources: 1

Cataloging & serials staff: 2

Cataloging & serials/e-resources: 3

Electronic resources: 1

Serials/Acquisitions: 14

Serials & electronic resource staff: 8

Misc.: 7

One library has circulation staff maintain the data. Another library has reference staff maintain the data.

**10. Does your library currently add/maintain any level of holdings data for electronic serials in a separate list of electronic serials titles outside your ILS? (153)**

Yes: 89  
No: 64

**Where does your electronic serials holdings data reside? (86)**

Outside the ILS, libraries also maintain e-serials title lists in various places, including Access, SQL database, spreadsheet, and Serials Solution's web list.

Access: 11

Cold Fusion: 2

FileMaker: 2

InMagic: 1

Oracle: 2

SFX: 3

SQL: 15

Serials Solutions provided list: 20

Spreadsheet: 14

TDNet: 4

Web pages: 6

Word: 1

Misc.: 2

**What holdings information does your library provide? (82)**

a. Summary

b. Detailed

c. Open-ended

d. Closed

a: 10    b: 0    c: 23    d: 0

a&c: 10

a&c&d: 14

a&b&c&d: 3

a&d: 2

b&c&d: 1

c&d: 17

**Who adds/maintains this data? (85)**

Cataloging: 7

Electronic resources: 17

Reference: 5

Serials/Acquisitions: 15

Serials & electronic resource staff: 8

Serials Solutions/TDNet: 24

Systems: 5

**11. Does your library report your holdings of electronic serials to a union list? (152)**

Yes: 32

No: 120

**If yes, which union list does your library report to? (17+)**

*Note: Due to an error in programming, the responses to this question from the first 17 libraries who answered "yes" were not captured.*

OCLC: 7  
SERHOLD: 3  
Misc.: 5

**12. Do you think your library's current practice with electronic serials holdings/coverage statement is meeting the needs of your users? (144)**

Yes: 89

No: 55

One respondent answered that lack of staff held them back in providing more information to users, as well as "an unclear national direction to buy into." One respondent (who uses Serials Solutions) commented that holdings information from the aggregators may be wrong and it isn't easy to get those corrected, and s/he would like to have more control. One also noted that having holdings information is important for interlibrary loan purposes. Another respondent felt that the information in OPAC and the separate e-serials list should be consistent, including holdings information.

**Publication Patterns and Electronic Journals**

Out of the 155 survey responses, 125 responded to at least one of the three questions.

**13. Would detailed check-in data be useful for managing electronic serials? (109)**

Out of the 109 respondents, 54 said that detailed check in data is, or at least could be, useful for managing electronic serials. Although many of these respondents emphasized that checking in e-serials is not feasible in real world unless they have more staff or the automatic e-serials check in capability. A few more respondents were not certain about whether they would check in e-serials in the near future.

The benefits of having detailed check in data mentioned in the responses are as follows:

For library users:

- To be certain of the latest available issue
- To have expected dates of arrival
- To save steps in looking up information in aggregator databases

For library staff:

- To track what the library have paid for, and for claim issues not being posted (recent ones or sometimes in the middle of a run), to have more control of e-serials just as we claim missing issues in print, to be pro-active rather than reactive
- To alert library when online access is lost, or the subscription has lapsed / To verify access has been set up for new orders
- To measure publication delays / To compare the timeliness of print and electronic versions
- To assist in managing print collection in terms of cancellation and retention decisions
- To investigate service disruptions (at a central level, not institutional)

- To create management reports and statistics for e-serials
- To manage preservation projects, trigger archiving process
- To set up link server services (Steve may provide more insight about this aspect)
- To enable summary holdings be created automatically
- To manage single titles that are not available through aggregator
- To trigger cataloging process for monographic series
- For interlibrary loan staff, especially when the e-version is your only version
- To have richer data about e-serials
- More useful for the vendors who supply the “aggregator” service/subscription

Why check in data for e-serials isn't necessary?

- Users can go to the web site and find out soon enough
- Many e-serials sites offer journal Table of Contents service or other alert services
- Link resolvers are bringing users directly to articles
- Usefulness doesn't outweigh the cost to maintain the data
- Users don't really read holdings statements; they just click on the link
- Not sure check-in is the right way to alert us to access problems, moribund titles, etc.
- Summary or full holdings info would suffice for management reports
- Uncertain that print-based procedures can be usefully and efficiently applied to e-resources
- Public and detailed check in data would imply that the library is responsible for gaps or delays
- Not realistic within existing e-serials environment “a solution in search of a problem”
- e-serials publications are even less predictable than print
- Claiming often means calling tech support. Can generate report from the provider on how many issues are available & how often they are used
- Can't claim e-serials issues

#### **14. Would publication pattern data in 891 in OCLC records be useful? (105)**

105 respondents answered this question. Most answers are consistent with Q13. Many pointed out it depends on their ILS's capability to handle the 891 data and MARC holdings standard. A couple of interesting comments:

- Will be useful to keep frequency and pattern updated on the bibliographic records for titles we have electronic format only
- Having an authoritative source to refer to regarding years of availability for an e-journal would be helpful, even if/when the local collection didn't include the full run. If a single record with multiple 891 fields is used to show holdings from all providers, it would be helpful to have one place to look to see how coverage compares from various sources
- Need publication data that can be downloaded into our ILS and function seamlessly with predictive check in mechanisms
- May enable us to pull the holdings info into our SQL database

- It would save time and effort for individual institutions in not having to manually enter or spend time verifying various common title publication patterns. However, it is not clear that being tied to the MARC record is the best solution
- It is difficult to ascertain the publication pattern of electronic serials. If CONSER provided this information, they might have already resolved that issue with the publisher

**15. What parts of pattern data do you consider most useful? (100)**

100 respondents answered this question. Approximately 25 responded that they don't think (or were not sure) any of the pattern data is useful. Out of the remaining 75 respondents, 12 felt all three parts are important.

Of the remaining 63 respondents, 35 considered the enumeration and chronology of holdings data in field 863 to be more useful, while 27 respondents considered the prediction fields (frequency and regularity) useful. Many also chose both 863 and prediction data. Only 5 respondents mentioned caption data.